

1 OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
2 ERIC M. ALDERETE, CAL BAR NO. 199565
3 Eric.alderete@usbank.com
4 U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
5 3121 Michelson Drive, 5th Floor
6 Irvine, CA 92612
7 Telephone: 949-798-6781
8 Facsimile: 949-798-4258
9
10 DANA J. DUNWOODY, Cal. Bar No. 119696
11 ddunwoody@sheppardmullin.com
12 J. BARRETT MARUM, Cal. Bar No. 228628
13 bmarum@sheppardmullin.com
SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
A Limited Liability Partnership
Including Professional Corporations
501 West Broadway, 19th Floor
San Diego, California 92101-3598
Telephone: 619-338-6500
Facsimile: 619-234-3815
11
12 Attorneys for Defendant
13 U.S. Bank National Association, Successor in
Interest to the Federal Deposit Insurance
Corporation as Receiver for Downey Savings
and Loan Association, F.A.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

18 CARLA GIESEN, an individual; and
BRYAN GIESEN, an individual.

Plaintiffs.

V.

21 U.S. BANK LOAN SERVICES, INC.,
22 a Delaware Corporation;
23 HOMECOMINGS FINANCIAL
24 SERVICES, LLC (f/k/a Homecomings
Financial Network, Inc.), a Delaware
25 Limited Liability Company; WALL ST.
MORTGAGE, INC., a California
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive.

Defendants.

Case No. 09-cv-7122-GAF (SSx)

**U.S. BANK NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION, SUCCESSOR IN
INTEREST TO THE FEDERAL
DEPOSIT INSURANCE
CORPORATION AS RECEIVER
FOR DOWNEY SAVINGS AND
LOAN ASSOCIATION, F.A.'S
MOTION TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT FOR FAILURE TO
STATE A CLAIM**

Date: 12/21/09
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Crtrm: 740

Hon. Gary A. Feess

[Complaint Filed: July 27, 2009]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	I.	INTRODUCTION	1
3	II.	LEGAL STANDARD	2
4	III.	DISCUSSION.....	4
5	A.	Plaintiffs' TILA Rescission Claim Must Be Dismissed For Their Failure To Allege Facts Demonstrating Their Ability To Tender The Loan Proceeds.....	4
6	B.	Plaintiffs' Unlawful And Unfair Business Practices Claim Is Preempted.....	6
7	1.	Any TILA damages claim Plaintiffs might bring is time- barred.....	7
8	2.	California law is preempted to the extent Plaintiffs seek to use it to circumvent federal limitations periods imposed on TILA damage claims.	7
9	IV.	CONCLUSION	9

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES2 Cases

3 <i>American Bankers Ass'n v. Lockyer</i> , 239 F. Supp. 2d 1000 (E.D. Cal. 2002).....	8
5 <i>American Mortgage Network, Inc. v. Shelton</i> , 486 F.3d 815 (4th Cir. 2007).....	4, 5
6 <i>Angulo v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.</i> , 2009 WL 3427179 (E.D. Cal., Oct. 26, 2009)	5
8 <i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. ___, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 2009 WL 1361536 (2009)	3, 6
9 <i>Bank of America v. City and County of San Francisco</i> , 309 F.3d 551 (9th Cir. 2002).....	7, 8
10 <i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 127 S. Ct. 1955 (2007).....	3
12 <i>Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc.</i> , 505 U.S. 504 (1992)	7
14 <i>Fidelity Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. de la Cuesta</i> , 458 U.S. 141, 162-63 (1982)	7
15 <i>Garza v. American Home Mortgage</i> , 2009 WL 188604 (E.D. Cal., Jan. 27, 2009).....	4, 6
17 <i>King v. State of California</i> , 784 F.2d 910 (9th Cir. 1986)	7
18 <i>LaGrone v. Johnson</i> , 534 F.2d 1360 (9th Cir. 1976).....	4
20 <i>Lal v. American Home Mortgage Servicing, Inc.</i> , 2009 WL 3126450 (E.D. Cal., Sept. 24, 2009)	5
21 <i>M'Culloch v. Maryland</i> , 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316, 4 L. Ed. 579 (1819)	8
23 <i>Navarro v. Block</i> , 250 F.3d 729 (9th Cir. 2001)	2
24 <i>Neitzke v. Williams</i> , 490 U.S. 319 (1989)	2
26 <i>Parrino v. FHP, Inc.</i> , 146 F.3d 699 (9th Cir. 1998)	3
27 <i>Rendon v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.</i> , 2009 WL 3126400 (E.D. Cal., Sept. 24, 2009)	5

1	<i>Roberts v. Corrothers</i> , 812 F.2d 1173 (9th Cir. 1987)	3
2	<i>Robertson v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc.</i> , 749 F.2d 530 (9th Cir. 1984)	2
4	<i>Silvas v. E*Trade Mortg. Corp.</i> , 421 F. Supp. 2d 1315 (S.D. Cal. 2006) <i>aff'd</i> 514 F.3d 1001 (9th Cir. 2008)	8, 9
6	<i>Sprewell v. Golden State Warriors</i> , 266 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2001)	3
7	<i>Thompson v. Davis</i> , 295 F.3d 890 (9th Cir. 2002)	2
9	<i>United States v. Locke</i> , 529 U.S. 89 (2000)	8
10	<i>Western Mining Council v. Watt</i> , 643 F.2d 618 (9th Cir. 1981)	3
12	<i>Yamamoto v. Bank of New York</i> , 329 F.3d 1167 (9th Cir. 2003)	4
13	<u>Statutes</u>	
14	12 C.F.R. § 560.2	8
15	12 C.F.R. § 560.2(a)	8
16	12 C.F.R. § 560.2(b)(9)	8
17	15 U.S.C. § 1635	5
18	15 U.S.C. § 1635(b)	4
19	15 U.S.C. § 1640	6
20	15 U.S.C. § 1640(e)	7
21	Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200	2, 6, 7, 9
22	U.S. Const., Art VI, cl.2	7

1
2 U.S. Bank National Association, Successor in Interest to the Federal Deposit
3 Insurance Corporation as Receiver for Downey Savings and Loan Association, F.A.
4 ("U.S. Bank") hereby submits its memorandum of points and authorities in support
5 of its motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint ("FAC") for failure to
6 state a claim as follows:

7 **I.**

8 **INTRODUCTION**

9 Plaintiffs' FAC is as flawed as Plaintiffs' original complaint. Plaintiffs'
10 amendment, while it has addressed the statute of limitations problem with their
11 original complaint, has done nothing to remedy the other deficiencies identified by
12 U.S. Bank in its motion to dismiss their original pleading. Thus, Plaintiffs' FAC
13 should be dismissed for the reasons outlined below.

14 The fundamental flaw with Plaintiff's first claim for relief, for rescission
15 pursuant to the Truth in Lending Act ("TILA"), is that it seeks to turn U.S. Bank
16 into an unsecured creditor that can only hope Plaintiffs have the financial ability to
17 honor their admitted obligation to tender the loan proceeds to U.S. Bank. Courts
18 within the Ninth Circuit and across the country have recognized the inequity in such
19 a result and have refused to entertain TILA rescission claims without specific
20 allegations demonstrating the plaintiff's ability to tender the loan proceeds if the
21 court were to order rescission.

22 This result makes sense – it would be a waste of all parties' and the Court's
23 resources to take a TILA rescission claim to judgment only to learn that the plaintiff
24 lacks the financial ability to tender the loan proceeds. Thus, courts have regularly
25 addressed these issues at the pleading stage and have dismissed TILA rescission
26 lawsuits where plaintiffs have been unable to allege facts demonstrating their ability
27 to repay the loan proceeds. Indeed, some courts have gone so far as to issue orders
28 to show cause requiring plaintiffs to present proof of their ability to tender before

1 ruling on a motion to dismiss. *See e.g. Hernandez v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 09-
 2 CV-1910 H, Doc. No. 18 (S.D. Cal. November 12, 2009).

3 At the very least, more detailed allegations regarding Plaintiffs' alleged
 4 financial ability to tender are required here. Plaintiffs admit in their FAC that they
 5 must, as a condition to rescission under TILA, tender the loan proceeds to U.S.
 6 Bank. Plaintiffs then allege, without any supporting facts, that they have the ability
 7 to tender the \$267,750 they admit they received from U.S. Bank. More is required
 8 under the caselaw interpreting the TILA tender requirement. Accordingly, U.S.
 9 Bank respectfully requests that the Court dismiss Plaintiffs' TILA rescission claim.

10 Plaintiffs' second and final claim for relief, for alleged violations of California
 11 Business and Professions Code section 17200, must also be dismissed. Plaintiffs
 12 seek to use their section 17200 claim to revive an otherwise time-barred TILA
 13 damages claim, something they clearly may not do under Ninth Circuit law. Thus,
 14 Plaintiffs' second claim for relief should be dismissed as well.

15 **II.**

16 **LEGAL STANDARD**

17 A Rule 12(b)(6) motion tests the sufficiency of the complaint. *Navarro v.*
 18 *Block*, 250 F.3d 729, 732 (9th Cir. 2001). Dismissal is warranted under Rule
 19 12(b)(6) where the complaint lacks a cognizable legal theory. *Robertson v. Dean*
 20 *Witter Reynolds, Inc.*, 749 F.2d 530, 534 (9th Cir. 1984); *see Neitzke v. Williams*,
 21 490 U.S. 319, 326 (1989) ("Rule 12(b)(6) authorizes a court to dismiss a claim on
 22 the basis of a dispositive issue of law."). Alternatively, a complaint may be
 23 dismissed where it presents a cognizable legal theory yet fails to plead essential
 24 facts under that theory. *Robertson*, 749 F.2d at 534.

25 In reviewing a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), the court must assume
 26 the truth of all properly pled factual allegations and must construe them in the light
 27 most favorable to the nonmoving party. *Thompson v. Davis*, 295 F.3d 890, 895 (9th
 28 Cir. 2002), *cert denied*, 538 U.S. 921 (2003). While the allegations of the complaint

1 are generally accepted as true, the complaint must allege "enough facts to state a
 2 claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 127 S.
 3 Ct. 1955, 1974 (2007). "[A] plaintiff's obligation to provide 'grounds' of his
 4 'entitlement to relief requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic
 5 recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do." *Id.* at 1964-65 (internal
 6 quotation and citation omitted). "Nor does a complaint suffice if it tenders 'naked
 7 assertion[s]' devoid of 'further factual enhancement.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U. S.
 8 ___, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 2009 WL 1361536 (2009) (Slip. op. at 14).

9 Further, legal conclusions need not be taken as true merely because they are
 10 cast in the form of factual allegations. *Roberts v. Corrothers*, 812 F.2d 1173, 1177
 11 (9th Cir. 1987); *Western Mining Council v. Watt*, 643 F.2d 618, 624 (9th Cir. 1981).
 12 "Nor is the court required to accept as true allegations that are merely conclusory,
 13 unwarranted deductions of fact, or unreasonable inferences." *Sprewell v. Golden
 14 State Warriors*, 266 F.3d 979, 988 (9th Cir. 2001), *amended by* 275 F.3d 1187 (9th
 15 Cir. 2001). When ruling on a motion to dismiss, the court may consider the facts
 16 alleged in the complaint, documents attached to the complaint, documents relied
 17 upon but not attached to the complaint when authenticity is not contested, and
 18 matters of which the court takes judicial notice. *Parrino v. FHP, Inc.*, 146 F.3d 699,
 19 705-06 (9th Cir. 1998).

20 "To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual
 21 matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'"
 22 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U. S. ___, (Slip. op. at 14). "A claim has facial plausibility
 23 when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable
 24 inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." *Id.* "The
 25 plausibility standard is not akin to a 'probability requirement,' but it asks for more
 26 than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully." *Id.* "Where a
 27 complaint pleads facts that are 'merely consistent with' a defendant's liability, it
 28 'stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of 'entitlement to relief.'" -3-

1 *Id.* "Rule 8 marks a notable and generous departure from the hyper-technical, code-
 2 pleading regime of a prior era, but it does not unlock the doors of discovery for a
 3 plaintiff armed with nothing more than conclusions." *Id.*

4 **III.**

5 **DISCUSSION**

6 A. **Plaintiffs' TILA Rescission Claim Must Be Dismissed For Their Failure To**
 7 **Allege Facts Demonstrating Their Ability To Tender The Loan Proceeds.**

8 Plaintiffs claim that U.S. Bank violated TILA by allegedly failing to properly
 9 disclose the negative amortization features of their loan. (FAC ¶ 15.) Based upon
 10 this violation, Plaintiffs purport to have cancelled their loan via a July 24, 2009
 11 letter sent by their attorney to U.S. Bank. (FAC ¶ 11.)

12 To obtain rescission pursuant to TILA, "an obligor shall tender the property to
 13 the creditor." 15 U.S.C. § 1635(b). That is, "prior to ordering rescission based on a
 14 lender's alleged TILA violations, a court may require borrowers to prove ability to
 15 repay loan proceeds." *Garza v. American Home Mortgage*, 2009 WL 188604 at *4,
 16 (E.D. Cal., Jan. 27, 2009) (granting motion to dismiss where the complaint failed to
 17 sufficiently allege facts demonstrating the plaintiff's ability to repay the loan
 18 proceeds). "[R]escission should be conditioned on repayment of the amounts
 19 advanced by the lender." *Yamamoto v. Bank of New York*, 329 F.3d 1167, 1171 (9th
 20 Cir. 2003); *see LaGrone v. Johnson*, 534 F.2d 1360, 1362 (9th Cir. 1976) ("[T]he
 21 district court erred in not conditioning rescission on the tender of the net amounts
 22 advanced by the [lender]."). If the borrowers are "unable to tender the loan
 23 proceeds, the remedy of unconditional rescission [is] inappropriate." *American*
 24 *Mortgage Network, Inc. v. Shelton*, 486 F.3d 815, 821 (4th Cir. 2007).

25 Plaintiffs do not allege that they have tendered the remaining loan proceeds,
 26 nor do they provide any facts to support their conclusory allegation that they have
 27 the ability to do so. The best they do is plead that, "after Defendant USB has
 28 tendered its proceeds and taken action to reflect that its interest in the security has

1 been eliminated, Plaintiffs will tender their proceeds (and have the ability to do so)
 2 given to them by Defendant USB in accordance with applicable statutes and case
 3 law." (FAC ¶ 16.) This is not enough. The tender requirement (and the fact that
 4 courts generally require the tender prior to rescission) is meant to protect the lender
 5 against becoming an unsecured creditor of a borrower who cannot pay back the
 6 substantial loan money that he or she has received. *See American Mortgage*
 7 *Network*, 486 F.3d at 821 ("Clearly it was not the intent of Congress to reduce the
 8 mortgage company to an unsecured creditor or to simply permit the debtor to
 9 indefinitely extend the loan without interest.").

10 Plaintiffs' FAC's failure to allege any facts demonstrating their ability to
 11 tender the loan proceeds is fatal to their TILA rescission claim. "The absence of a
 12 sufficiently alleged . . . tender of loan proceeds dooms [their] TILA rescission
 13 attempt to warrant its dismissal." *Rendon v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, 2009
 14 WL 3126400 at *6 (E.D. Cal., Sept. 24, 2009); *see Angulo v. Countrywide Home*
 15 *Loans, Inc.*, 2009 WL 3427179 at *4 (E.D. Cal., Oct. 26, 2009) ("The Plaintiffs . . .
 16 cannot state a claim for rescission under TILA without at least alleging that they are
 17 financially capable of tendering the loan proceeds."); *Lal v. American Home*
 18 *Mortgage Servicing, Inc.*, 2009 WL 3126450 at *2 (E.D. Cal., Sept. 24, 2009)
 19 (granting a motion to dismiss plaintiffs' TILA rescission claim where they "failed to
 20 allege that they are ready and able to tender the loan proceeds.").

21 Nor does the order of tender set forth in section 1635 relieve Plaintiffs of their
 22 obligation to allege facts demonstrating their financial ability to tender:

23 Ms. Garza correctly notes that 12 C.F.R. § 226.23(d) sets out
 24 procedural steps for TILA rescission. Ms. Garza appears to contend
 25 that her complaint is her notice of rescission in that it alleges: "Plaintiff
 26 now gives effective notice to rescind the Transaction without further
 notice, hereby surrenders the Property or its equivalent in value
 determined by application of all proceeds since origination ..." The
 complaint references no prior notice of rescission.

27 Ms. Garza's problem is that the complaint fails to address head on her
 28 ability to tender loan proceeds. The complaint fails to hint that Ms.

1 Garza is able to fulfill her obligations under 15 U.S.C. § 1635(b) and
 2 12 C.F.R. § 226.23(d). Rescission is an empty remedy without Ms.
 3 Garza's ability to pay back what she has received (less interest,
 4 finance charges, etc.). The complaint lacks a necessary element of
 5 Ms. Garza's TILA rescission claim. As such, the TILA rescission claim
 6 is dismissed with leave to amend to allege, subject to F.R.Civ.P. 11(b)
 7 requirements, that Ms. Garza has the ability to tender and pay back
 8 what she has received.

9
 10 *Garza*, 2009 WL 188604 at *5. Conclusory allegations of Plaintiffs' ability to
 11 tender are insufficient to support this element of Plaintiffs' TILA rescission claim.
 12 Ashcroft, 556 U.S. ___, (Slip op. at 14). As a result, Plaintiffs' TILA rescission
 13 claim must be dismissed.¹

14 B. Plaintiffs' Unlawful And Unfair Business Practices Claim Is Preempted.

15 Plaintiffs allege that U.S. Bank violated California Business and Professions
 16 Code section 17200 by failing to make various disclosures mandated by TILA
 17 and/or making such disclosures in a misleading manner. (FAC ¶ 19.) Plaintiffs thus
 18 seek to use section 17200 to recover money from U.S. Bank for what amount to
 19 alleged TILA violations.

20 Plaintiffs, however, have not asserted a TILA damages claim under 15 U.S.C.
 21 § 1640, nor could they insofar as the limitations period on such a claim has long
 22 since run. Instead, Plaintiffs seek to use section 17200 as an end-run around TILA's
 23 damages limitations period to recover money on an otherwise time-barred claim.
 24 The law is clear that they cannot do so and, as a result, their second cause of action
 25 should be dismissed.

26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 1010
 1011
 1012
 1013
 1014
 1015
 1016
 1017
 1018
 1019
 1020
 1021
 1022
 1023
 1024
 1025
 1026
 1027
 1028
 1029
 1030
 1031
 1032
 1033
 1034
 1035
 1036
 1037
 1038
 1039
 1040
 1041
 1042
 1043
 1044
 1045
 1046
 1047
 1048
 1049
 1050
 1051
 1052
 1053
 1054
 1055
 1056
 1057
 1058
 1059
 1060
 1061
 1062
 1063
 1064
 1065
 1066
 1067
 1068
 1069
 1070
 1071
 1072
 1073
 1074
 1075
 1076
 1077
 1078
 1079
 1080
 1081
 1082
 1083
 1084
 1085
 1086
 1087
 1088
 1089
 1090
 1091
 1092
 1093
 1094
 1095
 1096
 1097
 1098
 1099
 1100
 1101
 1102
 1103
 1104
 1105
 1106
 1107
 1108
 1109
 1110
 1111
 1112
 1113
 1114
 1115
 1116
 1117
 1118
 1119
 1120
 1121
 1122
 1123
 1124
 1125
 1126
 1127
 1128
 1129
 1130
 1131
 1132
 1133
 1134
 1135
 1136
 1137
 1138
 1139
 1140
 1141
 1142
 1143
 1144
 1145
 1146
 1147
 1148
 1149
 1150
 1151
 1152
 1153
 1154
 1155
 1156
 1157
 1158
 1159
 1160
 1161
 1162
 1163
 1164
 1165
 1166
 1167
 1168
 1169
 1170
 1171
 1172
 1173
 1174
 1175
 1176
 1177
 1178
 1179
 1180
 1181
 1182
 1183
 1184
 1185
 1186
 1187
 1188
 1189
 1190
 1191
 1192
 1193
 1194
 1195
 1196
 1197
 1198
 1199
 1200
 1201
 1202
 1203
 1204
 1205
 1206
 1207
 1208
 1209
 1210
 1211
 1212
 1213
 1214
 1215
 1216
 1217
 1218
 1219
 1220
 1221
 1222
 1223
 1224
 1225
 1226
 1227
 1228
 1229
 1230
 1231
 1232
 1233
 1234
 1235
 1236
 1237
 1238
 1239
 1240
 1241
 1242
 1243
 1244
 1245
 1246
 1247
 1248
 1249
 1250
 1251
 1252
 1253
 1254
 1255
 1256
 1257
 1258
 1259
 1260
 1261
 1262
 1263
 1264
 1265
 1266
 1267
 1268
 1269
 1270
 1271
 1272
 1273
 1274
 1275
 1276
 1277
 1278
 1279
 1280
 1281
 1282
 1283
 1284
 1285
 1286
 1287
 1288
 1289
 1290
 1291
 1292
 1293
 1294
 1295
 1296
 1297
 1298
 1299
 1300
 1301
 1302
 1303
 1304
 1305
 1306
 1307
 1308
 1309
 1310
 1311
 1312
 1313
 1314
 1315
 1316
 1317
 1318
 1319
 1320
 1321
 1322
 1323
 1324
 1325
 1326
 1327
 1328
 1329
 1330
 1331
 1332
 1333
 1334
 1335
 1336
 1337
 1338
 1339
 1340
 1341
 1342
 1343
 1344
 1345
 1346
 1347
 1348
 1349
 1350
 1351
 1352
 1353
 1354
 1355
 1356
 1357
 1358
 1359
 1360
 1361
 1362
 1363
 1364
 1365
 1366
 1367
 1368
 1369
 1370
 1371
 1372
 1373
 1374
 1375
 1376
 1377
 1378
 1379
 1380
 1381
 1382
 1383
 1384
 1385
 1386
 1387
 1388
 1389
 1390
 1391
 1392
 1393
 1394
 1395
 1396
 1397
 1398
 1399
 1400
 1401
 1402
 1403
 1404
 1405
 1406
 1407
 1408
 1409
 1410
 1411
 1412
 1413
 1414
 1415
 1416
 1417
 1418
 1419
 1420
 1421
 1422
 1423
 1424
 1425
 1426
 1427
 1428
 1429
 1430
 1431
 1432
 1433
 1434
 1435
 1436
 1437
 1438
 1439
 1440
 1441
 1442
 1443
 1444
 1445
 1446
 1447
 1448
 1449
 1450
 1451
 1452
 1453
 1454
 1455
 1456
 1457
 1458
 1459
 1460
 1461
 1462
 1463
 1464
 1465
 1466
 1467
 1468
 1469
 1470
 1471
 1472
 1

1. Any TILA damages claim Plaintiffs might bring is time-barred.

2 The allegations in the FAC demonstrate that any TILA damages claim
3 Plaintiffs might bring based on loan-related disclosures would be time-barred. A
4 TILA damages claim must be brought "within one year from the date of the
5 occurrence of the violation." 15 U.S.C. § 1640(e). In the Ninth Circuit, this
6 limitations period runs from the date the loan transaction is consummated. *See King*
7 *v. State of California*, 784 F.2d 910, 915 (9th Cir. 1986).

8 Here, Plaintiffs admit that the loan transaction was consummated on July 26,
9 2006. (FAC ¶ 6.) Plaintiffs did not file their original complaint until July 27, 2009,
10 long after the TILA damages limitations period had run on July 26, 2007. Thus, any
11 TILA damages claim Plaintiffs might bring based on the alleged disclosure
12 violations they attempt to challenge with their section 17200 claim would be time-
13 barred.

2. California law is preempted to the extent Plaintiffs seek to use it to circumvent federal limitations periods imposed on TILA damage claims.

17 Congress's power to preempt state law flows from the Supremacy Clause of
18 the United States Constitution. U.S. Const., Art VI, cl.2; *Cipollone v. Liggett*
19 *Group, Inc.*, 505 U.S. 504, 516 (1992). There are three different types of federal
20 preemption: (1) express preemption; (2) field preemption; and (3) conflict
21 preemption. *Bank of America v. City and County of San Francisco*, 309 F.3d 551,
22 558 (9th Cir. 2002). Congress may delegate its authority to preempt state laws to a
23 federal agency, as it did in this case through the Home Owners' Loan Act ("HOLA")
24 and the creation of the Office of Thrift Supervision ("OTS"). As the United States
25 Supreme Court settled conclusively in *Fidelity Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. de la*
26 *Cuesta*, in enacting the HOLA, Congress gave the OTS all the necessary authority to
27 promulgate regulations with the same preemptive force as direct congressional

1 legislation. 458 U.S. 141, 162-63 (1982).² Pursuant to HOLA, the OTS has
 2 promulgated broad regulations that govern the operations of every federal savings
 3 and loan association, such as Defendant. *Bank of America*, 309 F.3d at 558; 12
 4 C.F.R. ch. V, pts. 500-591.

5 One of those regulations, 12 C.F.R. § 560.2, provides that state laws may not
 6 regulate a federal thrift's lending activities. Section 560.2 provides, in pertinent part
 7 that:

8 OTS hereby occupies the entire field of lending regulation for federal
 9 savings associations. OTS intends to give federal savings associations
 maximum flexibility to exercise their lending powers in accordance
 10 with a uniform federal scheme of regulation. ***Accordingly, federal
 savings associations may extend credit as authorized under federal
 law, including this part, without regard to state laws purporting to
 regulate or otherwise affect their credit activities . . .***

12
 13 12 C.F.R. § 560.2(a) (emphasis supplied). Among the specific examples of the
 14 types of state laws that are preempted under section 560.2, are any state laws that
 15 purport to regulate a thrift's loan-related disclosure obligations. 12 C.F.R. §
 16 560.2(b)(9); *Silvas v. E*Trade Mortg. Corp.*, 421 F.Supp.2d 1315, 1319-20 (S.D.
 17 Cal. 2006) (holding that plaintiffs' unfair competition law claims were preempted
 18 because they sought to regulate a lender's conduct in connection with its TILA
 19 disclosures) *aff'd* 514 F.3d 1001 (9th Cir. 2008).³

20
 21 ² Generally, the preemption analysis begins with a presumption against
 22 preemption. However, where a state seeks to regulate a particular area of the
 23 law that has had a significant federal presence, the presumption against
 24 preemption is not triggered. *United States v. Locke*, 529 U.S. 89, 108 (2000).
 25 Banking regulation is just such an area: "Congress has legislated the field of
 26 banking from the days of *M'Culloch v. Maryland*, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316, 325-
 27 26, 426-27, 4 L.Ed. 579 (1819), creating an extensive federal statutory and
 28 regulatory scheme." *Bank of America*, 309 F.3d at 558. Thus, no presumption
 against preemption arises when a state law regulates the banking industry. *Id.* at
 559 ("[B]ecause there has been a history of significant federal presence in
 national banking, the presumption against preemption of state law is
 inapplicable.").

29
 30 ³ The OTS' promulgation of this regulation did not exceed the authority Congress
 31 delegated to it under HOLA. *American Bankers Ass'n v. Lockyer*, 239 F. Supp.
 32 2d 1000, 1011-12 (E.D. Cal. 2002). Moreover, the OTS has concluded that even

1 In *Silvas*, the district court specifically considered and rejected what Plaintiffs
2 seek to do here: Take advantage of the longer limitations period under section
3 17200 to seek relief for alleged TILA violations that would have otherwise been
4 time-barred. 421 F.Supp.2d 1315, 1320 (S.D. Cal. 2006), aff'd, *Silvas v E*Trade*
5 *Mortg. Corp.*, 514 F.3d 1001 (9th Cir. 2008). There, the court held that the
6 plaintiffs' action was just "... an attempt to use California's UCL to regulate the
7 defendants' lending activities, to secure damages under state law for alleged TILA
8 violations where a federal cause of action was no longer available. The application
9 of the UCL to Defendant ... is therefore ... preempted by section 560.2." *Id.* The
10 same is true of Plaintiffs' claim in this case insofar as it is based on alleged TILA
11 violations and the Court should therefore dismiss it with prejudice.⁴

IV.

CONCLUSION

14 For the foregoing reasons, U.S. Bank respectfully requests that the Court
15 grant its motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' FAC in its entirety.

16 | November 20, 2009

SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

By /s/ J. Barrett Marum

DANA J. DUNWOODY

J. BARRETT MARUM

Attorneys for Defendant

U.S. Bank National Association, Successor in
Interest to the Federal Deposit Insurance
Corporation as Receiver for Downey Savings
and Loan Association, F.A.

state laws that do no more than parrot TILA's requirements are preempted. *See Silvas*, 421 F.Supp.2d at 1319 n. 2.

25 4 Plaintiffs have not pled a section 17200 claim based on U.S. Bank's alleged
26 failure to properly respond to their TILA rescission notice, nor can they insofar
27 as their TILA rescission claim fails for the reasons discussed above. (Doc. No.
12 at 4) (holding that a plaintiff must assert a viable underlying violation of a
law to bring a section 17200 claim).